

**REMARKS**

Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview with Applicant's representatives, Roland McAndrews and Thomas Ho, conducted on June 28, 2007. During the interview, the claims were discussed, along with U.S. Patent No. 6,009,413 to Webber et al. ("Webber") and the web archive reference (Reference U from the Notice of References Cited mailed April 2, 2007). Various arguments were also presented with respect to the prior art rejections. No agreement was reached during the interview. The remarks submitted herewith are consistent with the issues discussed during the interview.

By this Reply, no amendments to the claims have been made. Accordingly, claims 1-40 remain pending in this application. Of the pending claims, claims 29-32 were previously withdrawn. No new matter has been introduced by this Reply.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-19, 22-26, and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber in view of the web archive reference; claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber in view of the web archive reference, in further view of the article (Reference V from the Notice of References Cited mailed April 2, 2007). Claims 3, 10, 17, and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 10, 17, and 24.

**The Prior Art Rejections**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-19, 22-26, and 33-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber in view of the web archive reference. Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to establish the *prima facie* case of obviousness required to reject these claims.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “sending a request for detailed dealer information to a manufacturer server system hosting a manufacturer’s web site and a plurality of dealer web sites, using a client system.” Webber, on the other hand, discloses a system 10 in which users connect to a network, make requests for product/service information residing at the network database, and the network computers receive data collected from merchants, put the data in usable protocol and organize it for each user so that “all of the product/service information requested by a user is contained in one on-screen presentation.” Webber, column 3, lines 33-48; and column 4, lines 1-5. Webber does not teach or suggest that any part of system 10, be it a network 22, a network host 56, or another network host 56’, hosts a manufacturer’s web site and a plurality of dealer web sites. In fact, Webber makes no mention of web sites at all. Since no part of system 10 hosts a manufacturer’s web site and a plurality of dealer web sites, Webber fails to teach or suggest, “sending a request for detailed dealer information to a manufacturer server system hosting a manufacturer’s web site and a plurality of dealer web sites, using a client system,” as recited in independent claim 1.

The web archive reference, cited as a modifying reference by the Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action, also does not teach or suggest hosting a manufacturer’s

web site and a plurality of dealer web sites on one server, nor is it cited for such a purpose. The web archive reference is cited to as a teaching of a method for requesting information and products from a dealer through a manufacturer. See Office Action, page 5. Even if this characterization of the web archive reference is accurate, and Applicant does not agree that it is, the web archive reference still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Webber for at least the reasons set forth below.

Pages 1-7 of the web archive reference depict a number of web pages from a manufacturer's web site. The web archive reference suggests that users can find dealer information by performing a dealer search using the web pages. However, the web archive reference fails to teach or suggest that there is a manufacturer server system hosting the manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer web sites. In fact, there are no dealer web sites disclosed in the web archive reference at all, just the manufacturer's web site. While the web pages suggest a dealer search capability, there is no evidence that users will be lead to a dealer website. The web archive reference only suggests that the user may be presented with dealer information, not a dealer's website. Thus, the web archive reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Webber.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Webber to have network 22, network host 56, or network host 56' host a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer web sites. Webber specifically states that "all of the product/service information requested by a user is contained in one on-screen presentation," and that "a user shopping for a book may see on the user's computer screen a display showing the current product/service information on books from multiple merchants. Taken further, resident software at the network host 56 may

perform other calculations designed to tailor presentation of the data for comparison shopping of books between merchants." Webber, column 3, lines 35-38; and column 5, lines 10-17. Modifying Webber to have merchant information displayed separately in a plurality of different merchant web sites would render system 10 of Webber unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of providing users with the ability to comparison shop between merchants on a single display screen, and would also change the principle of operation of system 10 of Webber by requiring that system 10 separate information into different web sites instead of combining the information into one display.

Since Webber and the web archive reference, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent claim 1, and since modifying Webber to have a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer web sites on one server would render Webber unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and change the principle of operation of Webber, the combination of Webber and the web archive reference fail to render independent claim 1 *prima facie* obvious. See M.P.E.P. 2143 and 2143.01. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1, and the timely allowance thereof is also respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8, 15, 22, 34, 35, and 37, while of different scope, each recite language similar to that of independent claim 1. For example, independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia* , "said manufacturer's server system hosting a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer's web sites." Independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "said manufacturer's server system hosting a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of

dealer's web sites." Independent claim 22 recites, *inter alia*, "said manufacturer's server system hosting a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer's web sites." Independent claim 34 recites, *inter alia*, "accessing a dealer's web site from a manufacturer's web site, both web sites being located on a manufacturer server system." Independent claim 35 recites, *inter alia*, "said manufacturer server system hosting a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer web sites." Independent claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, "accessing a dealer's web site located on a manufacturer server system from a client system, via a manufacturer's web site located on said manufacturer's server system." Thus, Webber and the web archive reference, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to render these claims *prima facie* obvious at least for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 8, 15, 22, 34, 35, and 37, and the timely allowance thereof.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 33, 36, and 38-40 each depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 34, 35, and 37, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons stated above that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 34, 35, and 37 are allowable. In addition, these dependent claims recite unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, and therefore each is also separately patentable.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber in view of the web archive reference, in further view of the article.

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 each depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22. The article fails to remedy the deficiencies of Webber and the web archive reference with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, nor is the article cited for such a purpose. Therefore, claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 and are allowable for at least the same reasons stated above that independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are allowable. In addition, these dependent claims recite unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, and therefore each is also separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 2, 2007

By:   
Roland G. McAndrews  
Reg. No. 41,450